

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1–19 were pending and were finally rejected. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1–9, 11–13, and 15–17, which includes all pending independent claims, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,201,859 to Memhard et al. (“Memhard”). However, independent claims 1, 7, and 9, as amended, each include at least one limitation not taught or suggested by Memhard. Rejection of these claims in view of Memhard is therefore inappropriate.

Specifically, Memhard contains no teaching or suggestion of a policy manager that applies policies that are based on a label associated with a media stream. Each of claims 1, 7, and 9 includes a limitation that the policy applied by the policy manager be determined at least in part as a function of a label associated with the media streams. As described in the specification of the present application, “labels” are used to describe the roles of media streams. See Abstract, page 2. “Labels” may be hierarchical and may include layers for media type, additional media source description. *Id.* at p. 17, l. 21–p. 18, l. 7. Because Memhard does not discuss roles of media streams, it similarly fails to discuss the corresponding “labels.” Independent claims 1, 7, and 9, as well as all claims depending therefrom are therefore allowable.

Examiner contends that the control token discussed in Memhard at col. 9, ll. 10–36 is the required label. Applicant disagrees. First, the control token is not associated with a media stream, but rather with a particular endpoint. The token is used to allow one participant, *e.g.*, a chairperson, to assert exclusive control over conference content. The current token holder can control any and all streams to the exclusion of all other participants. Second, the control token is not a label because it does not describe or indicate the roles of the media stream(s) with which it is associated. Examiner contends that this limitation was not in the claims presented in the prior office action response. While Applicant believes that this is implicit in the use of the term “label” when read in light of Applicant’s specification, Applicant has nonetheless amended each independent claim to more clearly recite that the label indicates a role of the associated media stream(s).

Finally, a token is an element separate and apart from the label. Applicant points out that dependent claims 6, 8, and 15 include limitations relating to token-based schemes similar to

those discussed in Memhard. The fact that these claims require both “labels” and a “token” clearly suggest that a token cannot be the required label.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that each of the pending claims 1–19 is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections and a notice of allowance for these claims is therefore requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner that would be helpful for moving the case toward issue.

\* \* \* \* \*

Respectfully submitted,

April 4, 2006  
Date

/Billy C. Allen III/  
Billy C. Allen III  
Reg. No. 46,147  
Attorney for Assignee

**CUSTOMER NO. 29855**  
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,  
RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.  
20333 State Hwy 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070  
Phone 832/446-2409  
Fax 832/446-2424